REMARKS

Status of the Claims

The Office Action mailed September 26, 2008 notes that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-10 are pending and rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-10. Claims 1, 4, and 7-10 are amended, no claims are currently cancelled. No new claims are added. No new matter is believed to be presented and approval and entry of this Amendment After Final is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. The rejections are traversed below.

Objection to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "dynamically-altered contents."

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

On page 3 of the Office action, claims 1, 4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

On page 3 of the Office action, claims 1, 4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The above objection to the specification and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs are traversed with an argument. It is respectfully submitted that support for "dynamically-altered contents" is found at least on page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 26 of the specification. In particular, page 9, lines 7-18 state:

> For example, if the two result information 81 indicating respectively a value "?? Ichiro" and a value "Shiromi, Chuoku, Osaka-city" are obtained by the process of the business logic 73a, an HTML file for displaying a Web page (a search result screen HG2) as shown in FIG. 4 is generated. **Hereinafter, a part whose display content is changed responding to a result of the process by the business logic (result information 81) as the "?? Ichiro" and a value "Shiromi, Chuoku, Osaka-city" in the Web page is referred to as a "dynamic part" or a "variable part".** In addition, a part except for the dynamic part in a Web page may be referred to as a "fixed part."

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that "dynamically-altered contents" is supported by the originally filed specification and described in such a way as to convey to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Further, the "dynamically-altered contents" are shown in Figure 4 as MV1 and MV2. The "dynamically-altered contents" are processed through the business logic 73a and 73b and are displayed as depicted in Figure 4. Thus, "dynamically-altered contents" does not constitute new matter and withdrawal of the objection to the specification, and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

On page 4 of the Office action, claims 1, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Pettersen (Patent No. US 6,826,594 B12; filed July 15, 2000).

Pettersen discusses a host web site server 110 which is used by a client to create and store dynamic web page content. A user creates and sets up attributes 140 to define the look and behavior of the page. A user may indicate how many banners randomly rotate when the dynamic content is displayed and indicate to the host server that the content can be automatically modified by the host server or only when manually requested by the user. All setup attributes are keyed to a unique user identification number UID 160. (See Pettersen, Abstract, Figure 3; column 24, lines 3-35).

The invention of the claims solves a problem not recognized much less solved by the prior art. In particular, it can occur that a website user sends input parameters to a web server, but as the web server attempts to display a web page based on the input parameters, an error occurs or the web page displays improperly. In such a situation, traditionally, the problem was difficult to overcome because a user may not remember the parameters entered or the time at which the web page was requested from the web server when the error occurred. This problem is solved by storing the entered parameters and allowing a webmaster of the web server to duplicate the exact same web page based on the parameters stored and troubleshoot the situation. The solution recited by the claims is discussed in more detail below.

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Pettersen does not disclose claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to clarify "a contents information process portion making a storage portion **store the determined dynamically-altered contents and the inputted parameter in connection with Web page identifying information on the Web page and user identifying information on the user.**" In other words, dynamically altered contents, and the inputted parameter are **stored in connection** with information to identify the web page and user

8

information of the person who requested the web page. This is depicted in the log file of Application Figure 5. Pettersen is silent on such a connection.

As a result, Pettersen also does not disclose

> a contents information extraction portion extracting, from among the dynamically-altered contents stored in the storage portion, contents of the Web page corresponding to the Web page identifying information and the user identifying information **both of which are designated by the administrator;**
>
> **a Web page regeneration portion regenerating the Web page by incorporating therein the extracted contents of the Web page;** and
>
> **a regenerated Web page transmission portion transmitting the regenerated Web page to a terminal device of the administrator.**

Pettersen merely discusses a way to generate a webpage with dynamic content sections by allowing a user to set various settings. A web server then retrieves the content based on pre-set settings which are set by the user without requesting input. Thus, Pettersen does not disclose "regenerating the web page by incorporating therein the extracted contents of the web page." The Office Action asserts on page 7 that "a modified web page is anal[gonous] with a regenerated web page or portion thereof. However, according to Merriam-Webster, "regenerate" means to restore to original strength or properties. (See regenerate – Definition from Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/regenerate%5B2%5D). This meaning is further emphasized by using the word "the" when referring to "regenerated web page" in claim 1.

As a result according to claim 1, the administrator can best duplicate the web page viewed by the user. If the web page were modified from its original form, as in Pettersen, the administrator would not be able to troubleshoot a problem with the web server or web page. Thus, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Pettersen.

Further, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Pettersen because Pettersen does not disclose "a contents information extraction portion extracting, from among the dynamically-altered contents stored in the storage portion, **contents of the Web page corresponding to the Web page identifying information and the user identifying information both of which are designated by the administrator.**" The web page identifying information and user identifying information are shown in Application Figure 5, in lines a2 and b2. For example, GID02 is web page identifying information and A123 is user identifying information. These "are designated by the administrator" and allow the administrator easily duplicate the Web page by

incorporating therein the extracted contents of the Web page, such as Name and Address seen in Figure 5 a3 and a4. Thus, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Pettersen.

Claims 8 and 9 recite similarly to claim 1 and thus also patentably distinguish over Pettersen for the reasons discussed above.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

On page 7 of the Office action, claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Pettersen</u> (Patent No. US 6,826,594B1; filed July 15, 2000) in view of Hawes (Patent No. US 6,094,62, filed April 30, 1998).

Hawes discusses separating cacheable and non-cacheable portions of a web page and only downloading the portions of a web page that are changed by retrieving the cached unchanged portions from memory. (See Hawes, column 2, lines 14-29). Claim 10 recites similarly to claims 1, 8 and 9 and Hawes does not cure the deficiencies of Pettersen discussed above. Thus, claim 10 is patentable over the cited references for the reasons discussed above. Claim 10 further distinguishes over Pettersen and Hawes because claim 10 recites "a designation reception portion receiving, from an administrator, designation of Web page identifying information, user identifying information and **a period of time.**" Pettersen does not discuss duplicating a web page based upon the time of access.

Dependent claim 2 also recites additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 2 recites "the contents information process portion makes the storage portion store only the contents information used by the Web page generation portion among the contents information." In particular, the cited references do not teach only storing "contents of the Web page corresponding to the Web page identifying information and the user identifying information." It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the cited references.

On page 13 of the Office action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Isaac in view of Carlson (Patent No. 6,697,849 B1, filing date of May 1, 2000) further in view of <u>Pettersen</u>.

Carlson merely discusses caching Java Server Page (JSP) component responses. (See Carlson, column 5, lines 29-40). Nothing was found or cited in Isaac and Carlson which cures the deficiencies of Pettersen. Thus, since independent claim 4 recites similarly to claims 1, 8 and 9, claim 4 patentably distinguishes over Isaac, Carlson, and Pettersen for reasons similar to

those discussed above. In particular, claim 4 distinguishes over the references by reciting "a replay logic unit regenerating the Web page."

On page 17 of the Office action, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1039a) as being unpatentable by Isaac, Carlson and Pettersen, in view of Bautista-Lloyd et al. (Patent No. 7,000,008 B2; filing date, April 16, 2001) hereinafter "Bautista-Lloyd) further in view of Hawes.

Bautista-Lloyd merely discusses a method of updating multiple regions of content in a web page separately of one another. (See Bautista-Lloyd, column 1, lines 54-57).

Nothing was found or cited in Isaac, Carlson, or Bautista-Lloyd which cures the deficiencies of Pettersen. Since claim 5 depends upon claim 4, claim 5 patentably distinguishes over Isaac, Carlson, Bautista-Lloyd and Pettersen for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4.

On page 19 of the Office action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Baustista-Lloyd in view of Hawes, further in view of Pettersen.

Nothing was found or cited in Bautista-Lloyd and Hawes which cures the deficiencies of Pettersen. Thus, since independent claim 7 recites similarly to claims 1, 8 and 9, claim 7 patentably distinguishes over Isaac, Carlson, and Pettersen for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____1/26/9_____

By: _____

J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501